



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,727	12/10/2001	David Hedman	871870-6	6900
23879	7590	05/16/2005	EXAMINER	
BRIAN M BERLINER, ESQ O'MELVENY & MYERS, LLP 400 SOUTH HOPE STREET LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2899			ROWAN, KURT C	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				3643

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/014,727	HEDMAN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kurt Rowan	3643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb. 22, 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 18-23, 26-30 and 36-43 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 18-23, 26-30, 36-43 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on Feb. 22, 2005 has been entered.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 18-23, 26-30, 36-40, 42-43 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,812. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the same method steps are recited

such as positioning a plurality of temperature probes, providing at least one ingress duct, heating an environmentally acceptable gas, directing the heated gas into the enclosure, monitoring the temperature of the probes, recording the temperatures establishing at least a slight positive pressure within the enclosure and venting the heated gas from the enclosure.

Specification

3. The use of the trademark HEPA has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 19, 22, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The use of HEPA is noted in the above claims. The use to Trademarks is improper since the subject matter making up the trademark can change with time. The generic terminology that makes up the trademark should be recited to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 18-23, 26-30, 36, 40, 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forbes '329 in view of Montellano for substantially the same reasons stated in the last Office Action.

The patents to Forbes and Montellano show insect destroying methods and have been discussed in the first Office Action. In reference to claims 18, 20, and 26, Forbes shows all of the method steps recited such as providing an ingress duct 51, heating a gas by burner 25 to a temperature lethal to a predetermined species as disclosed by Forbes in column 4, lines 22-63. Forbes shows directing the heated gas into the enclosure in Fig. 1 using ingress duct 41. Forbes shows extracting heated gas in column 4, lines 8-12. Forbes does not disclose extracting heat killed organisms which is shown by Montellano. Hence it would have been obvious to provide Forbes with an extraction step as shown by Montellano who vents and filters the outflow for the purpose of removing dead organisms. In reference to claim 36, Forbes discloses venting through a ventilation duct in column 3, lines 16-17. In reference to claim 37, it would have been obvious to provide the method of Forbes as modified by Montellano with a filter 3 as disclosed by Montellano to trap organisms killed during the operation of the method recited. In reference to claim 38, it would have been obvious to return filtered air to the

interior since Forbes discloses recalculating air in column 2, lines 50-53. In reference to claim 39, Montellano discloses using suction to pull air from an enclosure and it follows that the filter be placed before the suction to ensure proper operation as shown by Montellano in Fig. 1.

In reference to claim 40, Forbes discloses heating outside the enclosed structure in Figure 1 noting burner 25. In reference to claim 42, Forbes shows directing heated gas into the interior portion using a duct 51. In reference to claim 43, Forbes discloses heating for about one hour in column 4, line 54.

Response to Amendment

8. The declarations under 37 CFR 1.132 filed Feb. 22, 2005 to Geyer (with exhibit A by Abbot) and to Linford are insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 18-23, 26-30, 36-40, and 42-43 based upon Forbes in view of Montellano as set forth in the last Office action because: showing is not commensurate in scope with the claims, fails to set forth facts, and states that the claimed subject matter solved a problem that was long standing in the art. However, there is no showing that others of ordinary skill in the art were working on the problem and if so, for how long. If others were not working on the problem, then there was no long standing problem in the art. In addition, there is no evidence that if persons skilled in the art who were presumably working on the problem knew of the teachings of the above cited references, they would still be unable to solve the problem. See MPEP § 716.04. Claim 18 does not recite that the organisms are micro-organisms and that the filter used to remove them is a HEPA filter as detailed in paragraphs 7 and 14 of the declaration to Geyer. In fact some of the subject matter that

both declarations discuss, like the microorganisms from mold, have been deleted from the claims such as claims 23 and 30. Also, it is not clear if the heat tolerant HEPA filter air scrubber recited in paragraph numbered 7 of Geyer is the one used in the present invention. Also, the declarations talk about filtering in conjunction with recirculating the heated air as in paragraph numbered 8 in the Linford declaration. However, this feature is not recited in claim 18 or other independent claims for that matter. The declarations particularly Linford, in paragraphs numbered 11-12, fails to set forth facts and merely gives an opinion that the prior art reference to Montellano is merely a curiosity and even if considered, would be ineffective in removing the smaller allergens that are produced during the forced-convection of thermal eradication. However, claims 18, 20, and 26 do not recite small allergens.

9. In view of the foregoing, when all of the evidence is considered, the totality of the rebuttal evidence of nonobviousness fails to outweigh the evidence of obviousness.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kurt Rowan whose telephone number is (571) 272-6893. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on (571) 272-6891. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kurt Rowan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3643

KR